



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,804	10/31/2003	Howard C. Simonson	07844-631001	2491
21876 7590 12/15/2008 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. Box 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
BELOUSOV, ANDREY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2174				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/15/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/698,804

Applicant(s)

SIMONSON ET AL.

Examiner

ANDREY BELOUSOV

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 32-42 and 44-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 32-42 and 44-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in responsive to the amendment filed on 8/26/2008. Claims 1-23, 32-42, 44-52 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 44, 45, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eudora (Eudora® Email, User Manual for Windows, Version 5.1.1, Copyright (c) 2001 by Qualcomm Inc.; <http://www.eudora.com/techsupport/kb/2350hq.html>)

Claim 1, 32, 44: Eudora discloses a computer program product tangibly embodied on machine-readable storage device, the product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

- a. display a table of data (pg. 2) as an element of a graphical user interface display and display a set of markers, each marker being associated with a row of the table or each marker being associated with a column of the table (pg. 2: "Who" and "Size" column tabs; pg. 6), the table of data having two or more sort keys (pg. 2-3) having a sort key order including a most significant sort key (pg. 2, Size

- is the most significant sort key), each sort key being a row or each sort key being a column of the table, each sort key having a sort direction (pg. 4, ascending / descending), each sort key having a position in the sort key order (pg. 2);
- b. receive from the user an input gesture selecting a marker (pg. 2-3; selection of Who tab);
 - c. establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as the most significant sort key (pg. 3, Who column is sorted alphabetically) in response to the input gesture, and maintain the positions and sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (pg. 3, Size column is sorted secondarily, see rows the 3 rows "Hil" and 5 rows of "Ste");
 - d. sort the table of data according to the two or more sort keys, the sort key order, and the sort key directions in response to the input gesture (pg. 3); and
 - e. display the sorted data (pg. 3.)

Claim 2, 33: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, wherein the user input gesture is a selecting gesture for selecting the marker (pg. 2-3.)

Claim 3: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, wherein the user input gesture comprises a pointing device action on the marker (pg. 2-3.)

Claim 4: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, wherein the user input gesture is a mouse click on the marker (pg. 2-3.)

Claim 6, 35, 45: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, further comprising instructions to: represent the sort key order visually in the table by displaying the markers with a pattern of distinct visual properties (pg. 2-3: triangle indicates the most significant sort key.)

Claim 7: Eudora discloses the product of claim 6, wherein the pattern of distinct visual properties indicates the sort key order (pg. 2-3: triangle indicates the most significant sort key.)

Claim 11, 37, 47: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, further comprising instructions to: determine whether the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key (pg. 3: an inherent determination given that a selection of marker "Size" sets sorting to None), and if the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key, change a sort direction of the most significant key, and if the user selected marker is not associated with the most significant key (pg. 2-3, "Who" column is not most significant), establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker (pg. 3: "Who" column) as the most significant sort key, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (pg. 3.)

Claim 15: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, wherein the number of sort keys for the table of data is limited to a predetermined number greater than one (e.g. two, pg. 6.)

Claim 16, 38, 48: Eudora discloses the product of claim 15, wherein the table of data has one or more sort keys having a sort key order including a most significant sort key and a least significant sort key the product further comprising instructions to:

- a. determine whether the table of data has the predetermined number of sort keys (pg. 6: selection of which columns to view predetermines the number to be displayed), and
- b. if the table of data has the predetermined number of sort keys (pg. 2: e.g. two), remove the least significant sort key from the sort key order, establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker (pg. 3: "Who" is selected) as the most significant sort key, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (pg. 3), and
- c. if the table of data has fewer than the predetermined number of sort keys establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as the most significant sort key, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order.

Claim 18: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1, wherein the marker is a column header (pg. 2.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora.

Claim 5: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1. Eudora shows the use of a single click to as user input gesture. Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the user input gesture is a double mouse click on the marker. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the computing art to use a double click in lieu of a single click for selection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a double click. One would have been motivated to use a double click method of selection so as to meet the expectations of Window OS users.

Claim 19: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1. However Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the marker is a row header. The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in computing arts to use row headers. One would have been motivated to use row headers as opposed to column as it would be have been a mere

mechanical rearranging of parts (from column to row) of an invention involving only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Lane et al., (5,704,051.)

Claim 8, 9: Eudora discloses the product of claim 6. However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the pattern of distinct visual properties comprises a set of distinct colors. Lane discloses a graphical user interface including color coding using a pattern of distinct visual properties comprising a set of distinct colors (5:57-61.) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a well known technique of color coding patterns to improve similar graphical user interfaces of Lane and Eudora in the same manner to yield a predictable result of a graphical user interface that utilize color in a meaningful way to readily convey useful information to the user, as suggested in Lane.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Adelson et al., (5,006,722.)

Claim 10: Eudora discloses the product of claim 6. However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the pattern of distinct visual properties comprises a set of distinct non-textual representations identifying a sequence of each sort key in the sort key order.

Adelson discloses a means for color coding information so as to indicate different levels in an order (Abstract.) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a well known technique of color coding information so as to indicated different sort orders, as taught in Eudora, to improve the graphical user interfaces of Adelson and Eudora and yield a predictable result of a graphical user interface that utilizes color in a meaningful way to readily convey useful information to the user, as suggested in Adelson.

7. Claims 12, 13, 20, 34, 39 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies et al., (5,586,311.)

Claim 12, 34: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1. However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the user input gesture is a dragging gesture for selecting the marker by dragging the marker to an area on the graphical user interface display. Davies discloses a graphical user interface for data access and analysis, including user input gesture for drag and dropping a sort criteria object unto an icon and/or icon area (5:8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davies' teaching of using a drag and drop gesture with the disclosure of Eudora so as to provide a drag and drop means to specify a sort order. One would have been motivated to use a drag and drop means so as to provide an alternative way to do sort order, as suggested by Davies.

Claim 20, 39, 49: Eudora discloses a computer program product tangibly embodied on a machine-readable storage device for interacting with a user, the product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

- a. display a table of data (pg. 2) as an element of a graphical user interface display and display a set of markers, each marker being associated with a row of the table or each marker being associated with a column of the table (pg. 2: "Who" and "Size" column tabs; pg. 6), the table of data having two or more sort keys (pg. 2-3) having a sort key order including a most significant sort key (pg. 2, Size is the most significant sort key), each sort key being a row or each sort key being a column of the table, each sort key having a sort direction (pg. 4, ascending / descending), each sort key having a position in the sort key order (pg. 2);
- b. receive from the user one input gesture selecting a marker (pg. 2-3; selection of Who tab);
- c. establish the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as the most significant sort key (pg. 3, Who column is sorted alphabetically) in response to the input gesture, and maintain the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (pg. 3, Size column is sorted secondarily, see rows the 3 rows "Hil" and 5 rows of "Ste");
- d. sort the table of data according to the two or more sort keys, the sort key order, and the sort key directions in response to the input gesture (pg. 3); and
- e. display the sorted data (pg. 3.)

However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the user input gesture is dragging the marker from a location associated with a particular row or column of the table to another area of the graphical user interface display. Davies discloses a graphical user interface for data access and analysis, including user input gesture for drag and dropping a sort criteria object unto an icon and/or icon area (5:8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davies' teaching of using a drag and drop gesture with the disclosure of Eudora so as to provide a drag and drop means to specify a sort order. One would have been motivated to use a drag and drop means so as to provide an alternative way to do sort order, as suggested by Davies.

Claim 13: Eudora discloses the product of claim 12. Davies further discloses wherein the area on the graphical user interface display comprises an icon (Fig. 3: 92.)

8. Claims 21, 40 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies., and in further view of MacGregor (5,396,621.)

Claim 21, 40, 50: Eudora and Davies disclose the product of claim 20. However, Eudora does not disclose wherein the area of the graphical user interface display is an icon, the product further comprising instructions to:

- a. receive from the user an input gesture selecting the icon, the icon being associated with a separate sort key list window; and

- b. display, in the separate sort key list window on the graphical user interface display, a list of sort keys comprising the one or more sort keys for the table of data having a sort key order including the most significant sort key.

MacGregor discloses a similar product for sorting information, comprising instructions to:

- a. receive from the user an input gesture selecting the icon, the icon being associated with a separate sort key list window (Fig. 6(a): 602); and
- b. display, in the separate sort key list window on the graphical user interface display, a list of sort keys comprising the one or more sort keys for the table of data having a sort key order including the most significant sort key (Fig. 6(b)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the separately displayed sort key list window as taught by MacGregor to the teachings of Eudora and Davies as it was a known technique to use separate windows for detailed configurations to improve similar products such as MacGregor and Eudora in the same fashion to obtain a predictable result.

9. Claims 14, 22, 41 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies and in further view of Liu et al., (5,706,449.)

Claim 14: Eudora and Davies disclose the product of claim 12. However, Eudora and Davies do not explicitly disclose wherein the area on the graphical user interface display

comprises a sort key list window. Liu discloses a similar product for a user to efficiently specify multiple sort criteria, including a sort key window (Fig. 10: 38.) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Liu's teaching of a sort key window with the disclosures of Eudora and Davies for dragging and dropping sort criteria markers. One would have been motivated to drag and drop markers to a sort key list window so as to provide an alternative way to do sort order, as suggested in Davies.

Claim 22, 41, 51: Eudora and Davies disclose the product of claim 20. However, Eudora and Davies do not explicitly disclose wherein the area of the graphical user interface display is a separate sort key list window, further comprising instructions to:

- a. display in the separate sort key list window, a list of sort keys comprising the one or more sort keys for the table of data having a sort key order including the most significant sort key.

Liu discloses a similar product for a user to efficiently specify multiple sort criteria, including a sort key list window (Fig. 10: 38) further comprising instructions to:

- a. display in the separate sort key list window, a list of sort keys comprising the one or more sort keys for the table of data having a sort key order including the most significant sort key (Fig. 12: 38.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Liu's teaching of a sort key window with the disclosures of Eudora and Davies for dragging and dropping sort criteria markers. One would have been motivated to drag and drop markers to a sort key list window so as to provide an alternative way to do sort order, as suggested in Davies.

10. Claims 17, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Liu.

Claim 17, 36, 46: Eudora discloses the product of claim 1. However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose further comprising instructions to: receive from the user an input gesture deselecting a marker associated with a sort key; and remove the sort key associated with the deselected marker from the sort key order while maintaining the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order. Liu discloses a similar product for a user to efficiently specify multiple sort criteria, comprising instructions to:

- a. receive from the user an input gesture deselecting a marker associated with a sort key (Fig. 13; 6:6-21); and
- b. remove the sort key associated with the deselected marker from the sort key order while maintaining the positions and the sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (Fig. 13, 14; 6:6-21.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made combine the teaching of Liu to Eudora. One would have been motivated to deselect and maintain the positions of remaining sort keys as it was a known technique to improve similar devices in the same way to yield a predictable result.

11. Claims 23, 42 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eudora in view of Davies and in further view of MacGregor (5,396,621.)

Claim 23, 42, 52: Eudora discloses a computer program product tangibly embodied on machine-readable storage device for interacting with a user, the product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

- a. display a table of data (pg. 2) as an element of a graphical user interface display, and display a set of markers, each marker being associated with a row of the table or each marker being associated with a column of the table (pg. 2: "Who" and "Size" column tabs; pg. 6), the table of data having one or more sort keys having a sort key order including a most significant sort key (pg. 2, Size is the most significant sort key), each sort key being a row or each sort key being a column of the table, each sort key having a sort direction (pg. 4, ascending / descending);
- b. maintain the positions and sort directions of the remaining sort keys in the sort key order (pg. 3, Size column is sorted secondarily, see rows the 3 rows of "Hil" and 5 rows of "Ste");
- c. sort the table of data according to the two or more sort keys, the sort key order, and the sort key directions in response to the input gesture (pg. 3); and
- d. display the sorted data (pg. 3.)

However, Eudora does not explicitly disclose wherein the user input gesture is a dragging gesture for selecting the marker by dragging the marker from a location associated with a particular row or column of the table to an area on the graphical user interface display. Davies discloses a graphical user interface for data access and analysis, including user input gesture for drag and dropping a sort criteria object unto an icon and/or icon area (5:8-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Davies' teaching of using a drag and drop gesture with the disclosure of Eudora so as to provide a drag and drop means to specify a sort order. One would have been motivated to use a drag and drop means so as to provide an alternative way to do a sort order, as suggested by Davies.

Eudora does not explicitly disclose establishing the row or column associated with the user-selected marker as a sort key having a position in the sort key order defined by the location within the area. MacGregor discloses a sorting of information in a computerized spreadsheet or the like, including establishing a row or a column associated with a user-selected marker as a sort key having a position in the sort key order defined by the location within the area (Fig. 6(b).) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of MacGregor, having a numbered sort key order list, with the teaching of Eudora and Davies, so as to provide for establishing of a row or column to be associated with a user-selected marker (Eudora) as a result of by drag and dropping it (as disclosed in Davies) to a location within the area. One would have been motivated

to combine the teachings of MacGregor to Eudora and Davies so as to provide a readily readable list of sort keys in a sort order, as suggested by MacGregor.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 1: Applicant argues that that Eudora does not disclose sort keys having a sort key order. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites that "a table of data" is displayed, whereas with regard to the "sort key order" the claim recites such element in a "having" relationship to the table of data. As such, the Examiner does not find it necessary based on the wording of the claim that such an element would have to be explicitly displayed, but that it is sufficient that the table of data "has" such an order. Disclosure of Eudora, as shown on page 2 illustrates a sort key order vis-à-vis the two columns, "who" and "size", as having an order of sorting priority between the two.

Claim 6: Applicant argues that claim 6 requires a display of more than one marker, and that the marker of Eudora does not represent a sort key order. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 6, though requiring a display of markers, does not limit such a display to simultaneous display. Furthermore, the claim language does not further limit how the "representation" of the sort order is accomplished. Pages 2 and 3 of Eudora discloses two triangles paired with their respective columns, depending on user selection. Representation of the sort order is accomplished by a visual indication of the pairing of the triangle to respective column header, and as there are only two

columns, such visual indication between which of the two is the most significant is sufficient to determine the sort key order completely.

Claim 11: Applicant argues that Eudora does not disclose changing a sort direction of a most significant key if the user-selected marker is associated with the most significant key. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Eudora discloses that if the user selects the most significant sort key, the sort order is changed to None, and if the user selects another key, such "Who" on page 2, the sorting is changed as shown on page 3. The determination of whether the user selected key is most significant or not is inherent given the two differing outcomes.

Claim 16: Applicant argues that Eudora does not disclose removing a least significant sort key from a sort key order. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Preamble to Claim 1, on which Claim 16 depends, recites that the product is "operable to cause the data processing apparatus to," and further reciting user operation to cause execution of instructions, such as to remove the least significant sort key from the sort key order within a condition that the table of data has the predetermined number of sort keys. Eudora discloses that the number of sort keys is always predetermined, (see page 6 for column selection), as such the product of Eudora includes instructions that would allow a user to operate to cause a removable of any columns, including Size or Who.

Claim 10: Applicant argues that Adelson does not disclose a non-textual pattern identifying a sequence of each sort key in the sort key order. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The disclosure of Adelson was used to show the obviousness of using other

means of representing orders, and not for sort keys in sort key orders, as that is disclosed by Eudora.

Claim 20, 39, 49: Applicant argues that Davies does not disclose or suggest the object tools as associated with any columns or rows, Consequently, the objects in Davies which can be positions in an area of a graphical user interface display do not disclose or suggest dragging a marker from a location associated with a particular row or column to another area of a graphical user interface display. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The disclosure of Davies was used to show the obviousness for using other means for input selection, such as by dragging and dropping to a particular region, and not for particularities of the rows and columns, as that is disclosed by Eudora.

Claim 23, 42, and 52: Similar reasoning as above.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Belousov whose telephone number is (571) 270-1695. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (alternate Fri off) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

AB
December 4, 2008